How does geographical distance translate into genetic distance?

Verónica Miró Pina, Emmanuel Schertzer

March 2, 2017

arXiv:1703.00357v1 [q-bio.PE] 1 Mar 2017

Abstract

Geographic structure can affect patterns of genetic differentiation and speciation rates. In this article, we investigate the dynamics of genetic distances in a geographically structured metapopulation. We model the metapopulation as a weighted directed graph, with N vertices corresponding to N homogeneous subpopulations. The dynamics of the genetic distances is then controlled by two types of transitions -mutation and migration events between islands. Under a large population-long chromosome limit, we show that the genetic distance between two subpopulations converges to a deterministic quantity that can asymptotically be expressed in terms of the hitting time between two random walks in the metapopulation graph. Our result shows that the genetic distance between two subpopulations does not only depend on the direct migration rates between them but on the whole metapopulation structure.

1 Introduction

Genetic distances in structured populations. Speciation. In most species, the geographical range is much larger than the typical dispersal distance of its individuals. A species is usually structured into several local subpopulations with limited genetic contact. Because migration only connects neighbouring populations, more often than not, populations can only exchange genes indirectly, by reproducing with one or several intermediary populations. As a consequence, the geographical structure tends to buffer the homogenising effect of migration, and as such, it is considered to be one the main drivers for the persistence of genetic variability within species.

The aim of this note is to present some analytical results on the genetic composition of a species emerging from a given geographical structure. The motivation behind this work is two-fold. First, it is well established that genetic variability allows populations to adapt to environmental changes and to be rescued from extinction Bouzat [2010]. Secondly, the geographic structure of a species is one of the main drivers for the genetic differentiation between subpopulations, eventually leading to speciation: When two populations accumulate enough genetic differences, they may become reproductively isolated, and therefore considered as different species. This is the framework of Gavrilets et al. [1998, 2000a,b], Yamaguchi and Iwasa [2013, 2015] to model parapatric speciation, i.e. speciation in the presence of gene flow between subpopulations.

In those models, some loci on the chromosome are responsible for reproductive isolation. The number of segregating loci increases through the accumulation of mutations, and decreases after each migration event (creating the opportunity for some gene exchange between the migrants and the host population). When the number of segregating loci between two populations reaches a certain threshold, the two subpopulations become reproductively incompatible. This kind of dynamics may translate into complex patterns of speciation. One particularly intriguing example is the case of ring species Noest [1997],Gavrilets et al. [1998], where two neighbouring subpopulations are too different to be able to reproduce with one another but can exchange genes indirectly, by reproducing with a series of intermediate subpopulations that form a geographic

'ring'. How these patterns emerge and are maintained is still poorly understood, and we hope that our analytical result might shed some new light on the subject.

Our model is based on a generalisation of a model proposed by Yamaguchi and Iwasa [2013], Yamaguchi and Iwasa [2015] for the case of a metapopulation containing only two homogeneous subpopulations. The authors study how the genetic distance, defined as the number of loci differing between the two subpopulations, evolves through time. They derived a diffusion approximation for the genetic distance between the two subpopulations and deduced an expression for the time to speciation. In the present note, we extend the two-island model by Yamaguchi and Iwasa to a metapopulation divided into N subpopulations. In addition, to make the model more realistic, we take into account chromosomal recombination: this introduces a non-trivial spatial correlation between loci (along the chromosome), which plays a role in the stochasticity of the model. To take into account the geographic structure, we model the metapopulation as a weighted directed graph with N vertices, corresponding to the different subpopulations. Each directed edge (i, j) is equipped with a migration rate in each direction, M_{ij} and M_{ji}. (In particular, if two islands are not connected, we set $M_{ij} = M_{ji} = 0$.) As we shall see below, the extension from two to an arbitrary number of islands is not only non-trivial from a mathematical point of view, it also has some interesting biological implications that will be briefly discussed below.

As in Yamaguchi and Iwasa [2013], we will assume that migration and mutation events are rare. This allows us to implement a separation of time scales, disentangling the intra and the inter population dynamics. More specifically, we will assume that the fixation of new alleles – after a migration or a mutation event – is fast compared to the time separating two such events. This will allow us to assume genetically homogeneous subpopulations, i.e., each subpopulation will be identified with a chromosome consisting of l sites (see Section 2 for more details). In our population model, mutations accumulate at constant rate b per locus. We assume an infinite allele model, meaning that each mutation creates a new allele that was not already present in the population. Upon migration, the migrant alleles from population j fix instantaneously at a random set S of loci in the target population i. The set S is determined by the intra-island dynamics, which is chosen to be a Moran model with recombination, consistently with an underlying individual-based model described in Section 2. (In Yamaguchi and Iwasa [2013], Yamaguchi and Iwasa [2015], the authors only assumed that the migrant alleles are fixed independently at every locus, while we assume a correlation between loci along the chromosome, due to the mechanisms of recombination.)

Main result. The main result of this note (Theorem 3.5 below) is that the genetic distance between two subpopulations i and j does not depend solely on M_{ij}, M_{ji}, the migration rates between them. Instead, the whole metapopulation graph matters. We show that under a large population-long chromosome limit, the genetic distance at equilibrium between i and j is given by the following deterministic quantity

$$D_\infty(i,j) \;=\; 1 - \mathbb{E}(e^{-2b_\infty \tau_{ij}}), \text{ where } \tau_{ij} = \inf\{t \geq 0 \;:\; S^i(t) = S^j(t)\}$$

and where S^i and S^j are two independent random walks on the metapopulation graph starting respectively from i and j and whose transition rate from k to p is equal to $\tilde{M}_{kp} := n'_{pk} M_{pk}/N_k$, where N_k denotes the (renormalised) population at site k and n'_{pk} the number of migrants from k to p at each migration event. Our result has a natural genealogical interpretation: S^i and S^j can be interpreted as the ancestral lineages starting from i and j, and our genetic distance is related to the probability that those lines meet before experiencing a mutation (or in other words, that i and j are Identical By Descent (IBD)).

One interesting consequence of our result is that the genetic distance between i and j depends on all possible paths between i and j in the graph (and not only the shortest one), i.e., it does not only depend on the direct gene flow between i and j but on the whole metapopulation structure.



(a) Geographic distances



(b) Genetic distances

Figure 1: Amplification of a geographic bottleneck in the genetic distance metrics (small value of c in Theorem 4.1). In this example, the metapopulation is formed of two complete graphs (all edges are not represented), connected by a single edge. (a) If i and j are connected, $M_{ij} = 1/N$: in (a) all the edges are the same length. (b) The genetic distances between pairs of vertices belonging to the same subgraph are smaller than the genetic distances between pairs of vertices belonging to different subgraphs.

In particular, this suggests that adding new subpopulations to the graph (which would correspond to colonisation of new demes) or removing any edge (which could correspond to the emergence of a geographical or reproductive barrier between two subpopulations) can potentially modify the whole genetic structure of the population.

One striking illustration of the previous discussion is presented in Section 4, where we consider an example where a geographic bottleneck is dramatically amplified in our new metric. We assume a metapopulation formed of two complete graphs (with N vertices each), connected by a single edge (see Figure 1). We assume that all the migration rates (between connected subpopulations) are equal to $1/N$, the mutation rate b is $\frac{c}{N}$, and all the subpopulation sizes are equal. In that case we can explicitly compute the genetic distances for large N (see Theorem 4.1). We found that, for subpopulations belonging to the same subgraph, the genetic distance – defined as the fraction of segregating loci between two subpopulations – converges to $\frac{c}{c+2}$, while, for subpopulations belonging to different subgraphs, the genetic distance is given by $1-\frac{1}{N}+o(\frac{1}{N})$. If we consider, as in Yamaguchi and Iwasa [2013], that two populations are different species if their genetic distance reaches a certain threshold, that will mean that this metapopulation structure promotes the emergence of two different species, each one corresponding to the population in one subgraph. Very often, parapatric speciation is believed to occur only in the presence of reduced gene flow. Our example shows that in the presence of a geographic bottleneck, genetic differentiation is manly driven by the geographical structure of the population, i.e., even if the gene flow between two neighbouring subpopulations is approximatively identical in the graph, the genetic distance is dramatically amplified at the bottleneck (see Figure 1).

We note that using the hitting time of random walks as a metric on graphs is not new, and has been a popular tool in graph analysis (see Doyle and Snell [1984] and Klein and Randic [1993]). For example, the commute distance, which is the time it takes a random walk to travel from vertex i to j and back, is commonly used in many fields such as machine learning Von Luxburg

et al. [2014], clustering Yen et al. [2005], social network analysis Liben-Nowell and Kleinberg [2003], image processing Qiu and Hancock [2005] or drug design Ivanciuc [2000], Roy [2004]. In our case the genetic distance is given by the Laplace transform of the hitting time between two random walks, which was already suggested as a metric on graphs by Hashimoto et al. [2015]. In that paper the authors claimed that this metrics preserves the cluster structure of the graph. In the example alluded above (Section 4), we found that our metrics reinforces the cluster structure of the metapopulation graph. In other words, a clustered geographic structure tends to increase genetic differentiation.

Technical challenges. We now briefly mention the main technical difficulties arising when generalising the Yamaguchi and Iwasa [2013] model from two populations to an arbitrary number of them. As already mentioned, and as in the two-island case, a migration event between i and j tends to reduce the genetic distance between the two populations. However with more than two islands, a migration event from i to j can potentially have an effect on the genetic distance between j and another subpopulation k – see Figure 2 for a specific example. In technical terms, the main difficulty when studying how the genetic distances evolve through time stands in the fact that the process of genetic distances is not Markovian, and more information is needed to follow the dynamics of the population. This point was largely ignored in previous analytical studies (Gavrilets [2000], Yamaguchi and Iwasa [2013]).



Locus fixed	$d_{i,j}$	$d_{i,k}$	$d_{k,j}$
1	1	2	3
2	1	2	1
3	2	2	2
4	2	2	2

Figure 2: The three subpopulations (i,j,k) are characterised by a chromosome with four loci (1,2,3,4), with different alleles (1a, 1b, ...). The three genetic distances $(d(i,j), d(i,k), d(k,j))$ are equal to two (before migration). The table shows the new genetic distances after a migration event from i to j where one locus from i is fixed in population j. At locus 1, the allelic partition $\Pi_1(t)$ is equal to $\{i\}\{j,k\}$, whereas at locus 4, $\Pi_4 = \{i,j\}\{k\}$.

To overcome this difficulty, we introduce an auxiliary process $(\Pi(t), t \geq 0)$, where $\Pi(t)$ is a vector of dimension l – the length of the chromosome – and where the k^{th} coordinate $\Pi_k(t)$ denotes the allelic partition at locus k at time t: two populations belong to the same block of the partition $\Pi_k(t)$ if they share the same allele at locus k (see Figure 2). In Theorem 3.3, we show that as the size of the chromosome goes to infinity, the vector $\Pi(t)$ behaves as an ergodic sequence. More specifically, the empirical measure associated to the sample $\Pi_1(t), \cdots, \Pi_l(t)$ – an object that we call the genetic partition probability measure – converges to a probability measure, corresponding to the allelic partition induced by a (single-locus) Moran-type model. Inspired from a well-known duality principle between the Moran model and the Kingman coalescent, we show that the genetic distances between two subpopulations can be expressed as functions of the hitting time between two ancestral lineages whose dynamics have been specified by the two random walks S^i and S^j above.

Outline. The paper is organised as follows. In Section 2 we describe an individual-based model that motivates the population-based model studied in this paper (and described in Section 3.1).

In Section 3.2, we properly introduce the main tool used in this paper: the genetic partition probability measure alluded above, and we state our main results (Theorems 3.3 and 3.5), i.e., an ergodic theorem describing the dynamics of the genetic partition measure under the large population-long chromosome limit and a description of the asymptotic genetic distances under the same assumption. In Section 3.3 we prove Theorem 3.5. Section 4 shows an application of our theorem to a population with a geographical bottleneck. Finally, Section 5 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 3.3.

2 Motivation: an individual based model under the rare migration-rare mutation regime

2.1 The individual-based model

In order to motivate the population-based model of Section 3.1 below (which will be the main object of this note), we start with a continuous-time individual-based model analogous to the one described in Yamaguchi and Iwasa [2013]. We assume a metapopulation of sexual haploid individuals divided into N subpopulations of size $n_i,\ i \in E := \{1, \cdots, N\}$, living on separate islands or island-like habitats. Each individual carries a single chromosome which is a sequence of l segregating loci. We then assume the following dynamics:

(D1) Each subpopulation evolves according to an haploid neutral Moran model with recombination (see Section 2.2 for more details).

(D2) Mutation occurs at rate u per individual, per locus according to an infinite allele model.

(D3) Migration from subpopulation i to subpopulation j occurs at rate m_{ij}. At each migration event a number of individuals n'_{ij} migrate from island i to island j (with $n'_{ij} < n_j$), and replace simultaneously n'_{ij} individuals chosen uniformly at random in the resident population.

If we assume that u and the m_{ij}'s are small (i.e., migration and mutation are rare), it is natural to observe the process on a longer time scale. This is done by rescaling time by m where $m \to 0$ is a scaling parameter such that $\forall i, j \leq N,\ m_{ij} = O(m)$. Under this scaling, the migration rate from i to j is given by

$$M_{ij} := \frac{m_{ij}}{m},$$

whereas the rate of mutation per locus per individual is given by

$$b := \frac{u}{m}.$$

It is well known that in the absence of mutation and migration, the neutral Moran model describing the dynamics at the local level ((D1) above) reaches fixation in finite time: the averaged time to fixation is related to the local size of the population, but also to the length of the chromosome (see Kimura and Ohta [1969], Kimura [1968]). Let us now assume that $1/m$ – the average time between two migration events – and $1/ul$ – the average time between two successive "effective" mutations, i.e., mutations fixing in the population– is much larger than the average time to fixation. This ensures that the fixation process is fast compared to the time-scale of mutation and migration, and as a result, intra-subpopulation diversity can be neglected. We can then consider subpopulations as homogeneous (except for short periods of time right after a migration event or a mutation event), with the following transition rates:

- Instantaneous fixation of a mutation in the population i at locus k occurs at rate b since

$$b = \underbrace{b \times n_i}_{\text{rate of mutation in subpopulation } i \text{ at locus } k} \times \underbrace{\frac{1}{n_i}}_{\text{proba of fixation of a mutation}}.$$

- Upon migration (occurring at rate M_{ij}), there is instantaneous fixation of the migrant alleles at a random set of loci. The corresponding set of loci – that we denote by $\mathcal{F}_{ij}$ – is determined by a Moran model with recombination that we now describe in more details.

2.2 Local dynamics: a multi-locus Moran model with recombination

In the following, we describe the dynamics (D1) in the absence of mutation and migration. We assume that each individual is haploid (i.e., only carries a single chromosome, which is a sequence of l discrete sites). At $t = 0$ (just after a migration event), the population is composed by n'_{ij} migrants, and $n_j - n'_{ij}$ residents (so that the total population size is equal to n_j). We then let the system evolve according to the following continuous time Moran dynamics with recombination:

- Each individual x (that we call the mother) reproduces at constant rate 1 and choses a random partner y ($y \neq x$) (the father). Upon reproduction, their offspring replaces a randomly chosen individual in the population.

- The new individual inherits a chromosome which is a mixture of the parental chromosomes created as follows. Both parental chromosomes are cut into fragments in the following way: we assume a Poisson Point Process of intensity λ/l on $[0, l]$, so that the number of Poisson points follows a Poisson distribution of parameter λ (regardless of the value of l). Two loci $k, k' \in \{1, \cdots, l\}$ belong to the same fragment iff there is no Poisson point on the interval $[k, k']$. For each fragment, the offspring inherits the fragment from the mother with probability $1/2$ and from the father with probability $1/2$.

Remark 2.1. *A crossing-over is observed between sites k and $k+1$ when there is a Poison point between these two sites and the left and right fragment are inherited from different parents, which happens with probability $1/2$. When $l \to \infty$, and the length of the chromosome is renormalised by $\frac{1}{l}$, the distribution of the positions of the crossing overs converges to a Poisson point process of parameter $\lambda/2$ on $[0, 1]$.*

This recombination mechanism introduces a non-trivial spatial correlation between loci: two loci that are close to each other are difficult to recombine. More precisely, for any two loci $k, k' \in \{1, \cdots l\}$, the recombination rate corresponds to the probability that there at least one Poisson point between k and k' and the two fragments are inherited from different parents and is given by

$$r_{k,k'} := \frac{1}{2}(1 - \exp(-\frac{\lambda}{l}|k - k'|)). \tag{1}$$

The set $\mathcal{F}_{ij}$. It is well known that the population described above reaches fixation in finite time, i.e., after a (random) finite time, every individual in the population carries the same genetic material, and from that time on, the system remains trapped in this configuration (see Kimura and Ohta [1969], Kimura [1968]). Starting with n'_{ij} mutant individuals (the migrants) and $n_j - n'_{ij}$ residents, $\mathcal{F}_{ij}$ is then defined as the set of loci with the mutant type upon fixation.

3 Population based model and main result

3.1 Definition and approximations

Population based model. Under the order of parameters specified above, the previous heuristics indicate that we can neglect intra-subpopulation diversity and assume that subpopulations are genetically homogeneous, i.e., each subpopulation can be identified with a single chromosome of length l. This allows us to translate the individual based model described in Section 2 into a population based model that we now describe and study. We represent each subpopulation as a single chromosome with l loci and consider a Markov chain with the following rates:

- For every $i \in E, k \in \{1, \cdots, l\}$: fix a new mutation at locus k in population i at rate b.
- For every $i, j \in E$ and every $S \subset \{1, \cdots, l\}$: at every locus in S, fix simultaneously the alleles from population i in population j at rate $M_{ij}\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{F}_{ij} = S)$, where $\mathcal{F}_{ij}$ has been defined in the previous section. (We set $\forall i \in E,\ M_{i,i} = 0$.)

We define the genetic distance between island i and j at time t as follows:

$$d_t(i,j) \ = \ \frac{1}{l}\#\{\ k \in \{1, \cdots, l\}\ :\ \text{subpopulations } i \text{ and } j \text{ differ at locus } k \text{ at time } t\ \}.$$

In the following, we identify the process $(\xi_t^\epsilon, t \geq 0)$ to a process in the set of the càdlàg functions from $\mathbb{R}^+$ to $\mathbb{R}^{Bell_N}$, equipped with the standard Skorokhod topology.

Remark 3.1. *Choose a locus $k \in \{1, \cdots, l\}$. We let the reader convince herself that the genetic composition at locus k follows the following Moran-type dynamics:*

(mutation) *"Individual" i takes on a new type (or allele) at rate b.*

(reproduction) *"Individual" j inherits its type from "individual" i at rate $M_{ij}\mathbb{P}(k \in \mathcal{F}_{ij})$. Further, in a neutral one-locus Moran model, the probability of fixation of a single allele in a resident population of size n_j is equal to its initial frequency, which in our case is n'_{ij}/n_j. Thus*

$$M_{ij}\mathbb{P}(k \in \mathcal{F}_{ij}) \ = \ M_{ij}\ n'_{ij}/n_j.$$

Remark 3.2. *At the population level, our model can be seen as a multi-locus Moran model with inhomogeneous reproduction rates. The main difficulty in analysing this model stems from the fact that there exists a non trivial correlation between loci: This correlation is induced by the fact that fixation of migrant alleles can occur simultaneously at several loci during a given migration event. In turn, the set of fixed alleles during a given migration event is determined by the local Moran dynamics described in Section 2.2.*

Large population-Long chromosome limit. In order to simplify the problem, we now make some further and natural approximations. We consider a large population–long chromosome limit. More precisely, we assume the existence of a scaling parameter $\epsilon \to 0$ such that

$$n_i \equiv n_i^\epsilon = [N_i/\epsilon] \ \text{ where } N_i > 0 \text{ remains constant as } \epsilon \to 0.$$

We will assume that $l \equiv l^\epsilon$ also depends on ϵ such that $l^\epsilon\epsilon \to \infty$ (long chromosome limit). We will also enforce that $b \equiv b^\epsilon$ depends on ϵ as well in such a way that

$$b^\epsilon/\epsilon \ \to \ b_\infty \ \text{ (Balance mutation-migration)}$$

that will ensure that at the limit, the effect of migration and mutation can both be observed. Now, the law for the random set of fixed alleles S, $\mathcal{F}_{ij}$, depends on ϵ. We make this dependence explicit by writing $\mathcal{F}_{ij}^\epsilon \equiv \mathcal{F}_{ij}$.

When ϵ is small, we do not observe any mutation or migration event on a time window of order 1. In order to observe some interesting dynamics, we will need to accelerate time. For a given value of $\epsilon > 0$, we define $(d_t^\epsilon(i,j); t \geq 0)$ the genetic distance between island i and j at time t/ϵ (i.e., time is accelerated by a factor $1/\epsilon$) in the model parametrised by ϵ.

3.2 The genetic partition measure

The main difficulty in dealing with the genetic distance is that it lacks the Markov property, and as a consequence, it is not directly amenable to analysis. To circumvent this difficulty, we now introduce an auxiliary process – the genetic partition probability measure – from which one can easily recover the genetic distances (see (3) below), and whose asymptotical dynamics is explicitly characterised in Theorem 3.3 below.

Definition. Let $\mathcal{P}_N$ the set of partitions of $\{1, \cdots, N\}$. Let $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_N$ and $i, j \in E$. Define $\mathcal{S}_i(\pi)$ as the element of $\mathcal{P}_N$ obtained from π by making i a singleton (e.g., $\mathcal{S}_2(\{1,2,3\}) = \{1,3\}\{2\}$). Define $\mathcal{I}_{ij}(\pi)$ as the element of $\mathcal{P}_N$ obtained from π by displacing j into the block containing i (e.g., $\mathcal{I}_{2,3}(\{1,3\}\{2\}) = \{1\}\{2,3\}$).

At every locus $k \in \{1, \cdots, l\}$ and every time t, the allele composition of the metapopulation induces a partition on E. More precisely, at locus k, two subpopulations are in the same block of the partition at time t iff they share the same allele at locus k. For every $k \in \{1, \cdots, l\}$, let us denote by $\Pi_k^\epsilon(t)$ the partition induced at locus k (see Figure 2). The vector $\Pi^\epsilon(t) = (\Pi_k^\epsilon(t);\ k \in \{1, \cdots, l\})$ describes the genetic composition of the population at time t, and according to the description of our dynamics, it is a Markov chain with the following transition rates:

- (mutation) For every $\Pi \in (\mathcal{P}_N)^l$, $i \in E$, $k \in \{1, \cdots, l\}$, define $\mathcal{S}_i^k$ to be the operator on $(\mathcal{P}_N)^l$ such that $\forall\ \Pi\ \in (\mathcal{P}_N)^l$

$$\mathcal{S}_i^k(\Pi) = \begin{cases} \Pi_j & \forall j \neq k \\ \mathcal{S}_i(\Pi_j) & j = k \end{cases}.$$

  The transition rate of the process from state Π to $\mathcal{S}_i^k(\Pi)$ is given by b^ϵ/ϵ. (Note the correction in $1/\epsilon$ due to the time rescaling.)

- (migration from i to j) For every $i, j \in E$, $S \subset \{1, \cdots, l\}$, define $\mathcal{I}_{ij}^S$ the operator on $(\mathcal{P}_N)^l$ such that $\forall\ \Pi\ \in (\mathcal{P}_N)^l$

$$\mathcal{I}_{ij}^S(\Pi) = \begin{cases} \Pi_k & \forall k \notin S \\ \mathcal{I}_{ij}(\Pi_k) & \forall k \in S \end{cases}.$$

  The transition rate of the process from Π to $\mathcal{I}_{ij}^S(\Pi)$ is given by $\frac{M_{ij}}{\epsilon}\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{F}_{ij}^\epsilon = S\right)$.

To summarise, for every test function h, the generator of Π^ϵ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{G}^\epsilon h(\Pi) \ &= \ \frac{1}{\epsilon}\sum_{i,j=1}^N M_{ij} \sum_{S \subset \{1,\cdots,l\}} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{F}_{ij}^\epsilon = S)\ [h(\mathcal{I}_{ij}^S(\Pi)) - h(\Pi)]\ + \\ &\quad \frac{b}{\epsilon}\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^l \Big(h(\mathcal{S}_i^k(\Pi)) - h(\Pi)\Big) \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Let $\mathcal{M}_N$ denote the space of signed finite measures on $\mathcal{P}_N$. Since $\mathcal{P}_N$ is finite, we can identify elements of $\mathcal{M}_N$ as vectors of $\mathbb{R}^{Bell_N}$, where $Bell_N$ is the Bell number, which counts the number

of elements in $\mathcal{P}_N$ (the number of partitions of N elements). In particular, if π is a partition of E, and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_N$, then $\mu(\pi)$ will correspond to the measure of the singleton $\{\pi\}$, or equivalently, to the "π^{th} coordinate" of the vector μ. We define the inner product $< \cdot, \cdot >$ as

$$\begin{aligned} < \cdot, \cdot >: \ \mathcal{M}_N \times \mathcal{M}_N &\to \mathbb{R} \\ m, v &\to \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_N} m(\pi) v(\pi). \end{aligned}$$

For every function $f : \mathcal{P}_N \to \mathcal{P}_N$, we define the operator $*$ s.t for every $m \in \mathcal{M}_N$, for every $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_N$, $f * m(\pi) = m(f^{-1}(\pi))$. In words, $f * m$ is the push-forward measure of m by f. Further, we will also consider square matrices indexed by elements in $\mathcal{P}_N$. For such a matrix K and an element $m \in \mathcal{M}_N$, we define $Km(\pi) := \sum_{\pi' \in \mathcal{P}_N} K(\pi, \pi') m(\pi')$.

Define

$$\begin{aligned} X \ : \ (\mathcal{P}_N)^l &\to \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{P}_N) \\ \Pi &\to \frac{1}{l} \sum_{k \leq l} \delta_{\Pi_k}, \end{aligned}$$

i.e., $X(\Pi)$ is the empirical measure associated to the "sample" $\Pi_1, \cdots, \Pi_l$. In the following,

$$\xi_t^\epsilon \ = \ X(\Pi^\epsilon(t))$$

will be referred to as the (empirical) genetic partition probability measure of the population. In particular, the genetic distance between i and j at time t can then be expressed in terms of ξ_t^ϵ as follows:

$$d_t^\epsilon(i,j) = 1 - \xi_t^\epsilon(\{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_N : \ i \sim_\pi j)\}). \tag{3}$$

Convergence of the genetic partition probability measure. Following Remark 3.1, for every $k \in \{1, \cdots, l\}$, the process $(\Pi_k^\epsilon(t); t \geq 0)$ – the partition at locus k – obeys the following dynamics:

1. (reproduction event) j is merged in the block containing i at rate $\frac{1}{\epsilon} M_{ij} \mathbb{P}\left(k \in \mathcal{F}_{ij}^\epsilon\right) = M_{ij} \frac{n'_{ij}}{\epsilon n_j}$.
2. (mutation) Individual i takes on a new type at rate b/ϵ.

The generator associated to the allelic partition at locus k is then given by

$$G^\epsilon g(\pi) = \sum_{i,j=1}^N M_{ij} \frac{n'_{ij}}{\epsilon n_j} \left(\ g(\mathcal{I}_{ij}(\pi)) - g(\pi) \ \right) \ + \ \frac{b}{\epsilon} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\ g(\mathcal{S}_i(\pi)) - g(\pi) \ \right). \tag{4}$$

Recall that $\epsilon n_i \equiv \epsilon n_i^\epsilon \to N_i$ and $b/\epsilon \equiv b^\epsilon/\epsilon \to b_\infty$, and thus

$$G^\epsilon g(\pi) \to Gg(\pi) := \sum_{i,j=1}^N \tilde{M}_{ji} \left(\ g(\mathcal{I}_{ij}(\pi)) - g(\pi) \ \right) \ + \ b_\infty \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\ g(\mathcal{S}_i(\pi)) - g(\pi) \ \right) \quad \text{as } \epsilon \to 0. \tag{5}$$

Direct computations yield that ${}^tG$, the transpose of the matrix G satisfies

$$\forall m \in \mathcal{M}_N, \quad {}^tGm \ = \ \sum_{i,j=1}^N \tilde{M}_{ji} (\mathcal{I}_{ij} * m - m) + b_\infty \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathcal{S}_i * m - m).$$

In the light of (5), the following theorem can be interpreted as an ergodic theorem: We show that the (dynamical) empirical measure constructed from the allelic partitions along the chromosome

converges to the probability measure of a single locus. As already mentioned in Remark 3.2, although in the underlying model the different loci are linked and do not fix independently, as the number of loci tends to infinity, they become decorrelated. In the large population-long chromosome limit, the latter result indicates that the model behaves as if infinitely many loci evolved independently according to the (one-locus) Moran model with generator G provided in (5).

In the following " $\Longrightarrow$" indicates the convergence in distribution.

Theorem 3.3 (Ergodic theorem along the chromosome)**.** *Assume that there exists a probability measure $P^0 \in \mathcal{M}_N$ such that the following convergence holds:*

$$X(\Pi^\epsilon(0)) \underset{\epsilon\to 0}{\longrightarrow} P^0. \tag{6}$$

Then

$$(\xi_t^\epsilon;\ t \geq 0) \underset{\epsilon\to 0}{\Longrightarrow} (P_t;\ t \geq 0) \text{ in the weak topology,}$$

where P solves the forward Kolmogorov equation associated to the aforementioned Moran model, i.e.,

$$\frac{d}{ds} P_s \ = \ {}^tG P_s$$

with initial condition $P_0 = P^0$ and where ${}^tG$ denotes the transpose of G. In particular,

$$\forall m \in \mathcal{M}_N, \quad {}^tGm \ = \ \sum_{i,j=1}^N \tilde{M}_{ji}(\mathcal{I}_{ij} * m - m) + b_\infty \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathcal{S}_i * m - m)\,.$$

Remark 3.4. *In the previous Theorem, the statement*

$$(\xi_t^\epsilon;\ t \geq 0) \underset{\epsilon\to 0}{\Longrightarrow} (P_t;\ t \geq 0) \text{ in the weak topology}$$

is meant in the following sense: we identify $(\xi_t^\epsilon;\ t \geq 0)$ as a function from $\mathbb{R}^+$ to $\mathbb{R}^{Bell_N}$; for every $T > 0$, the process $(\xi_t^\epsilon;\ t \in [0,T])$ converges in the Skorohod topology $D([0,T], \mathbb{R}^{Bell_N})$.

We postpone the proof of Theorem 3.3 until Section 5.

3.3 Convergence of genetic distances

As a straightforward corollary of Theorem 5, we can derive the main result of this paper.

Theorem 3.5. *For every $i, j \in E$, define the process $(D_t(i,j); t \geq 0)$ as follows:*

$$\forall t \geq 0, \quad D_t(i,j) \ = \ 1 \ - \ \int_0^t e^{-2b_\infty s} \mathbb{P}(\tau_{ij} \in ds) \ - \ \int_\pi e^{-2b_\infty t} \mathbb{P}\left(\tau_{ij} > t, S^i(t) \sim_\pi S^j(t)\right) P^0(d\pi)$$

where

$$\tau_{ij} = \inf\{t \geq 0 \ : \ S^i(t) = S^j(t)\},$$

and where S^i and S^j are two independent random walks on E starting respectively from i and j and whose transition rate from k to p is given by

$$\tilde{M}_{kp} \ := \ M_{pk} \frac{n'_{kp}}{N_k} \quad \text{for every } k, p \in \{1, \cdots, N\}.$$

Then

1. If (6) holds then

$$(d_t^\epsilon;\ t \geq 0) \underset{\epsilon \to 0}{\Longrightarrow} (D_t;\ t \geq 0) \text{ in distribution, in the weak topology.}$$

2.

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} D_t(i,j) = 1 - \mathbb{E}(e^{-2b_\infty \tau_{ij}}).$$

Proof of Theorem 3.5 based on Theorem 3.3. We note that the second item of Theorem 3.5 is a direct consequence of the dominated convergence theorem. We now turn to the proof of the first item. From (3) and Theorem 3.3 we get that $(d_t^\epsilon; t \geq 0)$ converges in distribution in the weak topology to $(1 - P_t(\pi \in \mathcal{P}_N, i \sim_\pi j); t \geq 0)$. It remains to show that this expression is identical to the one provided in Theorem 3.5. This is done in a standard way by using the graphical representation associated to the one-locus Moran model whose generator is specified by G (defined in equation (5)). It is well known that such a Moran model is encoded by a graphical representation that is generated by a sequence of independent Poisson Point Processes as follows:

- $(B_n^i, n \geq 1)$, with intensity measure $b_\infty dt$, that corresponds to mutation events at site i. At each point (i, B_n^i) we draw a $\star$ in the graphical representation (Figure 3(a)).
- $(T_n^{i,j}, n \geq 1)$, with intensity measure $\tilde{M}_{ji} dt$, that corresponds to reproduction events, where j is replaced by i. We draw an arrow from $(i, T_n^{i,j})$ to $(j, T_n^{i,j})$ in the graphical representation to indicate that lineage j inherits the type of lineage i.

We now give a characterisation of the dual process starting at t. We define $(S_t^1, S_t^2, \cdots, S_t^N)$ a sequence of piecewise continuous functions $[0,t] \to E$, where $\forall\ i \in E,\ S_t^i$ represents the ancestral lineage of individual i (sampled at time t). $S_t^i(t) = i$ and as time proceeds backwards, each time S_t^i encounters the tip of an arrow it jumps to the origin of the arrow. It is not hard to see that S_t^i is distributed as a random walk started at i and with transition rates from k to p equal to $\tilde{M}_{kp}$ and that $(S_t^1, S_t^2, \cdots, S_t^N)$ are distributed as coalescing random walks running backwards in time, i.e. they are independent when appart and become perfectly correlated when meeting each other. In Figure 3(c), $S_t^1, S_t^2, \cdots, S_t^N$ are represented in different colours.

Let $\tau_{i,j}^t = \inf\{s \geq 0,\ S_t^i(t-s) = S_t^j(t-s)\}$. By looking carefully at Figures 3(b) and 3(c), we let the reader convince herself that two individuals i and j have the same type at time t iff:

(i) $\tau_{i,j}^t \leq t$ and there are no $\star$ in the paths of S_t^i and S_t^j before $\tau_{i,j}^t$.
OR

(ii) $\tau_{i,j}^t \geq t$ and $S^i(0) \sim_{\pi_0} S^j(0)$ and S_t^i and S_t^j their is no $\star$ in their paths.

From here, it is easy to check that:

$$\begin{aligned} D_t(i,j) &= 1 - P_t(\{\pi, i \sim_\pi j) \\ &= 1 - \int_0^t e^{-2b_\infty s} \mathbb{P}(\tau_{ij} \in ds) ds - \int_\pi e^{-2b_\infty t} \mathbb{P}\left(\tau_{ij} > t, S^i(t) \sim_\pi S^j(t)\right)\ P^0(d\pi). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 3.5.



(a) Graphical representation of the Moran model

(b) Genetic partitioning process

(c) Ancestral lineages

Figure 3: Realisation of the genetic partitioning model and its dual. In Figure (b), colours indicate genetic types (that induce the partitions). In Figure (c), colours represent the ancestral lineages.

□

4 An example: a population with a geographic bottleneck

Let $N \in \mathbb{N}\setminus\{0\}$. We let $\mathcal{G}_1$ and $\mathcal{G}_2$ be two complete graphs of N vertices. We link the two graphs $\mathcal{G}_1$ and $\mathcal{G}_2$ by adding an extra edge (v_1, v_2), where $v_k, k = 1, 2$ is a given vertex in $\mathcal{G}_k$. We call $\mathcal{G}$ the resulting graph. We equip $\mathcal{G}$ with the following migration rates: if i is connected to j, then $M_{ij} = 1/N$ (so that the emigration rate from any vertex i is 1 if $i \neq v_1, v_2$ and $1 + \frac{1}{N}$ otherwise). We also assume that $N_i = 1$ and $n'_{ij} = 1$ for every neighbours i and j in $\mathcal{G}$, so that $\tilde{M}_{ij} = 1/N$.

We think of $\mathcal{G}$ as two well-mixed populations connected by a single geographic bottleneck.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $c > 0$. Let $b_\infty = \frac{c}{N}$. Then for any two neighbours $i, j \in \mathcal{G}$*

$$1 - \mathbb{E}\left(\exp(-b_\infty \tau_{ij})\right) = \begin{cases} \frac{c}{2+c} + o(1) & \text{if } i, j \in \mathcal{G}_1, \text{ or if } i, j \in \mathcal{G}_2 \\ 1 - \frac{1}{N} + o(\frac{1}{N}) & \text{if } i = v_1 \text{ and } j = v_2 \end{cases}$$

Proof. We give a brief sketch of the computations since the method is rather standard. We start with some general considerations. Consider a general meta-population with $\bar{N}$ islands. Define $a(i, j) = \mathbb{E}\left(\exp(-b_\infty \tau_{ij})\right)$. By conditioning on every possible move of the two walks on the small time interval $[0, dt]$, it is not hard to show that the $a(i, j)$'s satisfy the following system of linear equations: $\forall i \in \{1, \cdots, \bar{N}\}$, $a(i, i) = 1$ and $\forall i, j \in \{1, \cdots, \bar{N}\}$ with $i \neq j$:

$$0 = \sum_{k=1}^{\bar{N}} \left(a(k, j)\tilde{M}_{ik} + a(i, k)\tilde{M}_{jk} \right) - a(i, j) \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\bar{N}} (\tilde{M}_{ik} + \tilde{M}_{kj}) + b_\infty \right). \tag{7}$$

Let us now go back to our specific case (in particular $\bar{N} = 2N$). We distinguish between two types of points: the boundary points (either v_1 or v_2), and the interior points of the subgraphs $\mathcal{G}_1$ and $\mathcal{G}_2$ (points that are distinct from v_1 and v_2). For (i, j), with $i \neq j$, we say that (i, j) is of type

- (II) if the vertices belong to the interior of the same subgraph (either $\mathcal{G}_1$ or $\mathcal{G}_2$).
- $(I\bar{I})$ if the vertices belong to the interior of distinct subgraphs.

- (IB) if one of the vertex is in the interior of a subgraph, and the other vertex belongs to the boundary point of the same subgraph.
- $(I\bar{B})$, $(B\bar{B})$ are defined analogously.

By symmetry, $a(i,j)$ is invariant in each of those classes of pairs of points. We denote by $a(II)$ the value of $a(i,j)$ for (i,j) in (II). $a(I\bar{I}), a(IB), a(I\bar{B}), a(B\bar{B})$ are defined analogously. From this observation, we can inject those quantities in (7): this reduces the dimension of the linear problem from $\bar{N}(\bar{N}-1)$ to only 5. The system can then be solved explicitly and straightforward asymptotics yield Theorem 4.1.

□

5 Proof of Theorem 3.3

Recall the definition of $\mathbb{G}^\epsilon$, the generator of the process $(\Pi^\epsilon(t);\ t \geq 0)$, given in (2). Let $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a Borel bounded function and let $v \in \mathcal{M}_N$. Let $h(\Pi) = f(\langle X(\Pi), v\rangle)$. Then, it is straightforward to see from equation (2) that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{G}^\epsilon h(\Pi) &= \frac{1}{\epsilon}\sum_{i,j=1}^{N} M_{ij}\,\mathbb{E}\left(f(\langle X(\mathcal{I}_{ij}^S(\Pi)), v\rangle) - f(\langle X(\Pi), v\rangle)\right)\\ &+ \frac{bl}{\epsilon}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}\left(f(\langle X(\mathcal{S}_i^K(\Pi)), v\rangle) - f(\langle X(\Pi), v\rangle)\right), \qquad (8)\end{aligned}$$

where in the first line the expected value is taken with respect to the random variable S, distributed as $\mathcal{F}_{ij}^\epsilon$ and in the second line, the expected value is taken with respect to K, distributed as a uniform random variable on $\{1, \cdots, l\}$.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $v \in \mathcal{M}_N$, $g(\Pi) := \langle X(\Pi), v\rangle$. Then $\mathbb{G}^\epsilon g(\Pi) = \left\langle {}^tG^\epsilon X(\Pi), v\right\rangle$ where ${}^tG^\epsilon$ is the transpose of G^ϵ – the generator of the allelic partition at a single locus as defined in (4) – i.e.,*

$$\forall m \in \mathcal{M}_N,\quad {}^tG^\epsilon m = \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} M_{ij}\frac{n'_{ij}}{\epsilon n_i}(\mathcal{I}_{ij} * m - m) + \frac{b}{\epsilon}\sum_{i=1}^{N}(\mathcal{S}_i * m - m).$$

Proof. We define the two following signed measures:

$$\partial_{ij}^S X(\Pi) = X(\mathcal{I}_{ij}^S(\Pi)) - X(\Pi),\quad \partial_i^k X(\Pi) = X(\mathcal{S}_i^k(\Pi)) - X(\Pi) \qquad (9)$$

In words, $\partial_{ij}^S X(\Pi)$ is the change in the genetic partition measure $X(\Pi)$ if we merge j in the block of i at every locus in S, and $\partial_i^k X(\Pi)$ is the change in $X(\Pi)$ if we single out element i at locus k. Using those notations, for our particular choice of g, (8) writes

$$\mathbb{G}^\epsilon g(\Pi) = \frac{1}{\epsilon}\sum_{i,j=1}^{N} M_{ij}\,\mathbb{E}\left(\langle \partial_{ij}^S X(\Pi), v\rangle\right) + \frac{bl}{\epsilon}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}\left(\langle \partial_i^K X(\Pi), v\rangle\right).$$

We now show that for all $v \in \mathcal{M}_N$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left(\langle \partial_{ij}^S X(\Pi), v\rangle\right) &= \frac{n'_{ij}}{n_j}\langle \mathcal{I}_{ij} * X(\Pi) - X(\Pi), v\rangle,\\ \mathbb{E}\left(\langle \partial_i^K X(\Pi)\rangle\right) &= \frac{1}{l}\langle \mathcal{S}_i * X(\Pi) - X(\Pi), v\rangle. \qquad (10)\end{aligned}$$

We only prove the first identity. The second one can be shown along the same lines. Again, we let Π_k be the k^{th} coordinate of Π. By definition, the vector $\mathcal{I}_{ij}^S(\Pi)$ is only modified at the coordinates belonging to S, and thus

$$\begin{aligned}\left\langle \partial_{ij}^S X(\Pi), v\right\rangle &= \sum_{\pi\in\mathcal{P}_N} \frac{v(\pi)}{l}\left(|\{k\le l \ : \ (\mathcal{I}_{ij}^S(\Pi))_k=\pi\}| \ - \ |\{k\le l : \Pi_k=\pi\}|\right)\\ &= \sum_{\pi\in\mathcal{P}_N} \frac{v(\pi)}{l}\left(|\{k\in S \ : \ \mathcal{I}_{ij}(\Pi_k)=\pi\}| - |\{k\in S : \Pi_k=\pi\}|\right). \qquad (11)\end{aligned}$$

Secondly,

$$\mathbb{E}(|\{k\in S \ : \ \Pi_k=\pi\}|) \ = \ \mathbb{E}(\sum_{k\in S} 1_{\{\Pi_k=\pi\}}) \ = \ \sum_{k\le l} 1_{\{\Pi_k=\pi\}}\mathbb{E}(1_{\{k\in S\}})$$

Using the fact that $\mathbb{P}\left(k\in\mathcal{F}_{ij}^\epsilon\right) \ = \ M_{ij}\frac{n'_{ij}}{n_j}$ (see Remark 3.1):

$$\mathbb{E}(|\{k\in S \ : \ \Pi_k=\pi\}|) \ = \ \frac{n'_{ij}}{n_j}|\{k\le l, \ \Pi_k=\pi\}| = l\frac{n'_{ij}}{n_j}X(\Pi)(\pi). \qquad (12)$$

Furthermore, by applying (12) for every $\pi'\in\mathcal{I}_{ij}^{-1}(\pi)$ and then taking the sum over every such partitions, we get

$$\mathbb{E}(|\{k\in S \ : \ \mathcal{I}_{ij}(\Pi_k)=\pi\}| \ = \ l\frac{n'_{ij}}{n_j}X(\Pi)(\mathcal{I}_{ij}^{-1}(\pi)) = l\frac{n'_{ij}}{n_j}\ \mathcal{I}_{ij}*X(\Pi)(\pi).$$

This completes the proof of (10). From this result, we deduce that

$$\mathbb{G}^\epsilon g(\Pi) \ = \frac{1}{\epsilon}\sum_{i,j=1}^N M_{ij}\frac{n'_{ij}}{n_j}(\mathcal{I}_{ij}*X(\Pi)-X(\Pi)) \ + \ \frac{b}{\epsilon}\sum_{i=1}^N(\mathcal{S}_i*X(\Pi)-X(\Pi)).$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 5.1. □

Define for all $v\in\mathcal{M}_N$

$$M_t^{\epsilon,v} := \langle\xi_t^\epsilon, v\rangle \ - \ \int_0^t \left\langle {}^tG^\epsilon\xi_s^\epsilon, v\right\rangle ds, \quad B_t^{\epsilon,v} \ := \ \int_0^t \left\langle {}^tG^\epsilon\xi_s^\epsilon, v\right\rangle ds.$$

Since $\langle\xi_t^\epsilon, v\rangle$ is bounded, the previous result implies that $M^{\epsilon,v}$ is a martingale. Further, the semi-martingale $\langle\xi_t^\epsilon, v\rangle$ admits the following decomposition:

$$\langle\xi_t^\epsilon, v\rangle \ = \ M_t^{\epsilon,v} \ + \ B_t^{\epsilon,v}.$$

Lemma 5.2. *For all $v\in\mathcal{M}_N$*

$$\langle M^{\epsilon,v}\rangle_t \ = \ \epsilon\log(1/\epsilon)\int_0^t \ m^{\epsilon,v}(\Pi^\epsilon(s))ds$$

with

$$m^{\epsilon,v}(\Pi) = \frac{1}{\epsilon^2\log(1/\epsilon)}\sum_{i,j=1}^N \ M_{ij}\ \mathbb{E}\left(\left\langle\partial_{ij}^S X(\Pi), v\right\rangle^2\right) \ + \ \frac{bl}{\epsilon^2\log(1/\epsilon)}\sum_{i=1}^N\mathbb{E}\left(\left\langle\partial_i^K X(\Pi), v\right\rangle^2\right).$$

Proof. Let $h(\Pi) = \langle X(\Pi), v\rangle^2$. Then, by equation (8)

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{G}^\epsilon h(\Pi) &= \frac{1}{\epsilon}\sum_{i,j}^{N} M_{ij}\mathbb{E}\left(\left\langle X(\mathcal{I}_{ij}^S(\Pi), v)\right\rangle^2 - \langle X(\Pi), v\rangle^2\right) \\ &\quad + \frac{bl}{\epsilon}\sum_{i}^{N}\mathbb{E}\left(\left\langle X(\mathcal{S}_i^K(\Pi)), v\right\rangle^2 - \langle X(\Pi), v\rangle^2\right).\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}\left\langle X(\mathcal{I}_{ij}^S(\Pi)), v\right\rangle^2 - \langle X(\Pi), v\rangle^2 &= \left\langle X(\mathcal{I}_{ij}^S(\Pi)) - X(\Pi), v\right\rangle^2 + 2\left\langle X(\mathcal{I}_{ij}^S(\Pi)) - X(\Pi), v\right\rangle \langle X(\Pi), v\rangle \\ \left\langle X(\mathcal{S}_i^k(\Pi)), v\right\rangle^2 - \langle X(\Pi), v\rangle^2 &= \left\langle X(\mathcal{S}_i^k(\Pi)) - X(\Pi), v\right\rangle^2 + 2\left\langle X(\mathcal{S}_i^k(\Pi)) - X(\Pi), v\right\rangle \langle X(\Pi), v\rangle,\end{aligned}$$

the previous identities yield

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{G}^\epsilon h(\Pi) &= 2\mathbb{G}^\epsilon g(\Pi)\langle X(\Pi), v\rangle + \\ &\quad \frac{1}{\epsilon}\sum_{i,j=1}^{N} M_{ij}\mathbb{E}\left(\left\langle \partial_{ij}^S X(\Pi), v\right\rangle^2\right) + \frac{bl}{\epsilon}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}\left(\left\langle \partial_i^K X(\Pi), v\right\rangle^2\right),\end{aligned}$$

where $g(\Pi) = \langle X(\Pi), v\rangle$. As a consequence

$$\begin{aligned}&\langle X(\Pi^\epsilon(t)), v\rangle^2 - 2\int_0^t \mathbb{G}^\epsilon g(\Pi^\epsilon(s))\langle X(\Pi^\epsilon(s)), v\rangle\, ds \\ &- \int_0^t \frac{1}{\epsilon}\sum_{i,j=1}^{N} M_{ij}\mathbb{E}\left(\left\langle \partial_{ij}^S X(\Pi^\epsilon(s)), v\right\rangle^2\right) ds - \int_0^t \frac{bl}{\epsilon}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}\left(\left\langle \partial_i^K X(\Pi^\epsilon(s)), v\right\rangle^2\right) ds\end{aligned}$$

is a martingale. Further using Itô's formula, the process

$$\langle X(\Pi^\epsilon(t)), v\rangle^2 - 2\int_0^t \mathbb{G}^\epsilon g(\Pi^\epsilon(s))\langle X(\Pi^\epsilon(s)), v\rangle\, ds - \langle M^{\epsilon,v}\rangle_t$$

is also a martingale. Combining the two previous results completes the proof of Lemma 5.2. □

Proposition 5.3. *$\exists\ \beta > 0$ such that $\forall \epsilon \in (0,1), \forall \Pi \in (\mathcal{P}_N)^l$,*

$$\mid m_t^{\epsilon,v}(\Pi) \mid \ \leq \beta$$

Proposition 5.4. *Let $T > 0$. The family of random variables $(\xi^\epsilon;\ \epsilon > 0)$ is tight in the weak topology $D([0,T], \mathbb{R}^{Bell_N})$.*

We postpone the proof of Propositions 5.3 and 5.4 until Sections 5.1 and 5.2 respectively.

Proof of Theorem 3.3 based on Proposition 5.3 and 5.4. Since $(\xi^\epsilon;\ \epsilon > 0)$ is tight, we can always extract a subsequence converging in distribution (for the weak topology) to a limiting random measure process ξ. We will now show that ξ can only be the solution of the Kolmogorov equation alluded in Theorem 3.3. From Lemma 5.1, for every $v \in \mathcal{M}_N$,

$$\left\mid \left\langle {}^tG^\epsilon m, v\right\rangle \right\mid \ \leq \ (2\sum_{i,j=1}^{N} M_{ij}\,\frac{n'_{ij}}{\epsilon n_i} + \frac{2b^\epsilon N}{\epsilon})||v||_\infty, \tag{13}$$

where $||v||_\infty := \max_{\pi\in\mathcal{P}_N} v(\pi)$. Since as $\epsilon \to 0$, $n_i^\epsilon\epsilon \equiv n_i\epsilon \to N_i$ and $b^\epsilon/\epsilon \to b_\infty$, the term between parentheses also converges, and thus the RHS is uniformly bounded in ϵ. Finally, the bounded convergence theorem implies that for every $v \in \mathcal{M}_N$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\langle \xi_t, v\rangle - \int_0^t \left\langle {}^tG\xi_s, v\right\rangle ds\right)^2 = \lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\mathbb{E}\left(\langle \xi_t^\epsilon, v\rangle - \int_0^t \left\langle {}^tG^\epsilon\xi_s^\epsilon, v\right\rangle ds\right)^2,$$

where we used the fact that ${}^tG^\epsilon m \to {}^tGm$ for every $m \in \mathcal{M}_N$ (where G is defined as in Theorem 3.3). On the other hand, since

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\langle \xi_t^\epsilon, v\rangle - \int_0^t \left\langle {}^tG^\epsilon \xi_s^\epsilon, v\right\rangle ds\right)^2 = \mathbb{E}(\langle M^{\epsilon,v}\rangle_t),$$

Lemma 5.2 and Proposition 5.3 imply that

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\langle \xi_t, v\rangle - \int_0^t \left\langle {}^tG\xi_s, v\right\rangle ds\right)^2 = 0.$$

This ends the proof of Theorem 3.3. □

Remark 5.5 (Magnitude of the stochastic fluctuations)**.** *Lemma 5.1 and Proposition 5.3 entail that:*

(i) $\forall v \in \mathcal{M}_N$, $M_t^{\epsilon,v} := \langle \xi_t^\epsilon, v\rangle - \int_0^t \left\langle {}^tG^\epsilon \xi_s^\epsilon, v\right\rangle ds$ *is a martingale.*

(ii) $\forall v \in \mathcal{M}_N$, $\langle M^{\epsilon,v}\rangle_t \leq \epsilon \log(1/\epsilon) C$, *where* C *is a constant.*

This suggests that the order of magnitude of the fluctuations should be of the order of $\sqrt{\epsilon \log(1/\epsilon)}$.

Remark 5.6. *In Yamaguchi and Iwasa [2013], the authors proposed a diffusion approximation (only for the case of two subpopulations). Their approximation is based on the simplifying hypothesis that loci are fixed independently on each other – the number of fixed loci (after each migration event) follows a binomial distribution–. They found that the magnitude of the stochastic fluctuations was* $\sqrt{\epsilon}$. *In our model, taking into account correlations between loci increases the magnitude of the stochastic fluctuations, by a factor* $\sqrt{\log(\epsilon)}$.

5.1 Proof of Proposition 5.3

Our first step in proving Proposition 5.3 is to prove the following result.

Lemma 5.7. $\forall\, i, j \in E$, $\forall S \subset \{1, \cdots l\}$, $\exists\, \alpha > 0$,

$$\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \frac{1}{\epsilon^2 \log(1/\epsilon) l^2} \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{l} \sum_{k'=1}^{l} 1_{k \in S} 1_{k' \in S}\right) \leq \frac{n'_{ij}}{\alpha N_j^2}(3 + n'_{ij})$$

Before turning to the proof of this result, we recall the definition of the ancestral recombination graph (ARG) (see also Hudson [1983], Griffiths [1981], Griffiths [1991]) for the case of two loci, k and $k' \in \{1, \cdots, l\}$. In order to compute the probability that for both loci the allele from the migrant is fixed in the host population – $\mathbb{P}(k \in S, k' \in S)$ – we follow backwards in time the genealogy of the corresponding alleles carried by a reference individual in the present population, assuming that a migration event occurred in the past (sufficiently many generations ago, so that we can assume fixation).



(a) Moran model with recombination

(b) ARG

Figure 4: Realisation of Moran model with recombination and the Ancestral Recombination Graph. In the figures the population size is equal to 5 and $l = 2$. Time goes from top to bottom as indicated by the arrow on the left. In Figure (a) the origins of the arrows indicate the parents, and the tips of the arrows point to their offspring. The dashed arrow corresponds to the father and the solid line to the mother. In (b) the blue and pink lines correspond to the ancestral lineages of two distinct loci belonging to the same chromosome in the extant population.

More precisely, at locus k, we consider the ancestral lineage of a reference individual (chosen uniformly at random) in the extant population. We envision this lineage as a particle moving in $\{1, \cdots, n_j\}$: time $t = 0$ corresponds to the present, and the position of the particle at time t – denoted by $L_k(t)$ – identifies the ancestor of locus k, t units of time in the past (i.e., at locus k, the reference individual in the extant population inherits its genetic material from individual $L_k(t)$ at time $-t$) (see Figure 4).

Let us now consider $k, k' \in \{1, \cdots, l\}$ be two distinct loci. $\mathbf{L} = (L_k,\ L_{k'})$ defines a 2-dimensional stochastic process on $\{1, \cdots, n_j\}$. At time 0, the two particles have the same position (they coincide at a randomly chosen individual as in Figure 4) and then evolve according to the following dynamics:

- When both particles are occupying the same location z, the group splits into two at rate $r_{k,k'}$ (see (1)). Forward in time this corresponds to a reproduction event where z is replaced by the offspring of x (the mother) and y (the father). Each individual x reproduces at rate 1, and with probability $1/n_j$ his offspring replaces individual z. There are n_j possible choices for mother x. Following equation (1), the probability that both loci are inherited from different parents is $r_{k,k'}$, so the rate of fragmentation for loci k, k' is given by $n_j \,.\, \frac{1}{n_j} \,.\, r_{k,k'}$.

- When the two particles are occupying different positions, they jump to the same position at rate $\frac{2}{n_j}$. Forwards in time, this corresponds to a reproduction event where the individual located at L_k (resp. $L_{k'}$) replaces the one at $L_{k'}$ (resp. L_k), and the offspring inherits the allele at locus k' (resp. k) from this parent. A reproduction event where the individual located at L_k (resp. $L_{k'}$) replaces the one at $L_{k'}$ (resp. L_k) occurs at rate $2/n_j$ (as the individual at L_k –resp. $L_{k'}$– can be the mother or the father); and the probability that the offspring inherits the locus k' (resp. k) from this parent is $1/2$. The total rate of coalescence is $2 \,.\, \frac{2}{n_j} \,.\, \frac{1}{2}$.

Since we assume that the migration event occurred far back in the past, the following duality relation holds:

$$\mathbb{P}(k \in S, k' \in S) \ = \ \lim_{t \to \infty} \ \mathbb{P}\,(\ L_k(t)\ \in \Delta, L_{k'}(t)\ \in \Delta) \tag{14}$$

where $\Delta := \{1, \cdots, n'_{ij}\}$. In other words, assuming that migrants are labelled from 1 to n'_{ij}, the set on the RHS corresponds to the set of loci inheriting their genetic material from these individuals.

Proof of Lemma 5.7. Define $(Y(t) := 1_{L_k(s)=L_{k'}(s)}; s \geq 0)$. It is easy to see from the previous description of the dynamics that Y is a Markov chain on $\{0, 1\}$ with the following transition rates:

$$q_{1,0} = r_{k,k'}, \quad q_{0,1} = \frac{2}{n_j}$$

and further

- conditional on $Y(t) = 1$, the two lineages $(L_k(t), L_{k'}(t))$ occupy a common position that is distributed as a uniform random variable on $\{1, \cdots, n_j\}$.
- conditional on $Y(t) = 0$, $(L_k(t), L_{k'}(t))$ are distinct and are distributed as a two uniformly sampled random variables (without replacement) on $\{1, \cdots, n_j\}$.

Since

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(L_k(t) \in \Delta, L_{k'}(t) \in \Delta) &= \mathbb{P}(L_k(t) \in \Delta \mid Y(t) = 1)\mathbb{P}(Y(t) = 1) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}(L_k(t), L_{k'}(t) \in \Delta \mid Y(t) = 0)\mathbb{P}(Y(t) = 0),\end{aligned}$$

the previous argument implies that

$$\mathbb{P}(L_k(t) \in \Delta, L_{k'}(t) \in \Delta) = \mathbb{P}\left(Y(t) = 1\right) \frac{n'_{ij}}{n_j} \; + \; \mathbb{P}\left(Y(t) = 0\right) \frac{n'_{ij}(n'_{ij} - 1)}{n_j(n_j - 1)}.$$

Furthermore, it is straightforward to show that

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(Y(t) = 1\right) \; = \; \frac{2}{n_j} \frac{1}{r_{k,k'} + \frac{2}{n_j}}$$

and

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \; \mathbb{P}\left(Y(t) = 0\right) = \frac{r_{k,k'}}{r_{k,k'} + \frac{2}{n_j}}.$$

From (14), we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(\sum_{k,k'\in\{1,\cdots,l\}} 1_{k\in S} 1_{k'\in S}) \; &= \; \lim_{t\to\infty} \sum_{k,k'\in\{1,\cdots,l\}} \mathbb{P}(L_k(t) \in \Delta, L_{k'}(t) \in \Delta) \\ = \sum_{x,x'\in\{\frac{1}{l}\cdots 1\}} &\frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}(1 - e^{-\lambda|x-x'|}) + \frac{2}{n_j}} \left(\frac{2}{n_j}\frac{n'_{ij}}{n_j} + \frac{1}{2}(1 - e^{-\lambda|x-x'|})\frac{n'_{ij}(n'_{ij} - 1)}{n_j(n_j - 1)}\right)\end{aligned}$$

One can then easily check that, $\exists\ \alpha > 0$, such that:

$$\mathbb{E}(\sum_{k,k'\in\{1,\cdots,l\}} 1_{k\in S} 1_{k'\in S}) \; \leq \sum_{x,x'\in\{\frac{1}{l}\cdots 1\}} \frac{1}{\alpha|x - x'| + \frac{2}{n_j}} \left(\frac{2}{n_j}\frac{n'_{ij}}{n_j} + \frac{1}{2}\frac{n'_{ij}(n'_{ij} - 1)}{n_j(n_j - 1)}\right)$$

In addition, using the fact that $n_j \equiv n_j^\epsilon = [N_j/\epsilon]$ and that $N_j/\epsilon - 1 \leq [N_j/\epsilon] \leq N_j/\epsilon$

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{\epsilon^2 \log(1/\epsilon) l^2} \; \mathbb{E}(\sum_{k,k'\in\{1,\cdots,l\}} 1_{k\in S} 1_{k'\in S}) \\ \leq \; &\frac{1}{\log(1/\epsilon)} C_{ij}^\epsilon \int_{[0,1]^2} \frac{dtds}{\alpha|t - s| + 2\epsilon/N_j} + R(\epsilon)\end{aligned}$$

where

$$C_{ij}^{\epsilon} := \left(\frac{2n'_{ij}}{(N_j-\epsilon)^2} + \frac{1}{2}\frac{n'_{ij}(n'_{ij}-1)}{(N_j-\epsilon)(N_j-2\epsilon)} \right)$$

and

$$R(\epsilon) \;:=\; \frac{C_{ij}^{\epsilon}}{\log(1/\epsilon)} \left| \int_{[0,1]^2} \frac{dtds}{\alpha|t-s|+2\epsilon/N_j} - \frac{1}{l^2} \sum_{k,k' \in \{\frac{1}{l}\cdots 1\}} \frac{1}{\alpha|k-k'|+2\epsilon/N_j} \right|$$

and $R(\epsilon) \underset{\epsilon \to o}{\longrightarrow} 0$ (see Proposition 5.8 below). Finally,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{\epsilon^2 \log(1/\epsilon) l^2}\, \mathbb{E}\Big(\sum_{k,k' \in \{1,\cdots,l\}} 1_{k \in S} 1_{k' \in S} \Big) \\
\leq\; & \frac{2C_{ij}^{\epsilon}}{\log(1/\epsilon)} \int_0^1 ds \int_o^s \frac{dt}{\alpha|t-s|+2\epsilon/N_j} \;+\; R(\epsilon) \\
=\; & \frac{2C_{ij}^{\epsilon}}{\log(1/\epsilon)} \frac{1}{\alpha} \int_0^1 \log\left(\frac{\alpha N_j}{2\epsilon} s + 1 \right) ds \;+\; R(\epsilon) \\
=\; & \frac{2}{\alpha \log(1/\epsilon)} \left(\frac{2n'_{ij}}{(N_j-\epsilon)^2} + \frac{1}{2}\frac{n'_{ij}(n'_{ij}-1)}{(N_j-\epsilon)(N_j-2\epsilon)} \right) \left((1+\frac{2\epsilon}{\alpha N_j}) \log\left(\frac{\alpha N_j}{2\epsilon} + 1 \right) - 1 \right) \;+\; R(\epsilon) \\
\underset{\epsilon \to 0}{\longrightarrow}\; & \frac{n'_{ij}}{\alpha N_j^2}(3+n'_{ij}).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 5.8. *The quantity $R(\epsilon)$ goes to 0 as ϵ goes to 0.*

Proof. Setting $u = s - t$ and $v = s + t$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
I_\epsilon \;:=\; & \int_{[0,1]^2} \frac{dtds}{\alpha|t-s|+2\epsilon/N_j} \;=\; 2\int_0^1 \int_0^s \frac{dtds}{\alpha(s-t)+2\epsilon/N_j} \\
=\; & \int_0^1 \frac{du}{\alpha u + 2\epsilon/N_j} \int_u^{2-u} dv \;=\; 2\int_0^1 \frac{(1-u)du}{\alpha u + 2\epsilon/N_j}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
S_\epsilon \;:=\; & \frac{1}{l^2} \sum_{k,k' \in \{\frac{1}{l}\cdots 1\}} \frac{1}{\alpha|k-k'|+2\epsilon/N_j} \\
=\; & \frac{2}{l^2} \sum_{k<k' \in \{\frac{1}{l}\cdots 1\}} \frac{1}{\alpha|k-k'|+2\epsilon/N_j} + \frac{1}{l^2}\frac{N_j}{2\epsilon} \\
=\; & \frac{2}{l} \sum_{p \in \{1/l,\cdots,1\}} \frac{1-p}{\alpha p + 2\epsilon/N_j} + \frac{1}{l^2}\frac{N_j}{2\epsilon}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let

$$S'_\epsilon \;:=\; \frac{2}{l} \sum_{p \in \{0,\cdots,1-\frac{1}{l}\}} \frac{1-p}{\alpha p \;+\; 2\epsilon/N_j}.$$

Using the fact that $(S_\epsilon - \frac{1}{l^2}\frac{N_j}{2\epsilon}) \leq I_\epsilon \leq S'_\epsilon$:

$$R(\epsilon) \quad \leq \quad \frac{C_{i,j}^{\epsilon}}{\log(1/\epsilon)} |S'_\epsilon - (S_\epsilon - \frac{1}{l^2}\frac{N_j}{2\epsilon})| \;= \frac{C_{i,j}^{\epsilon} N_j}{l\epsilon \log(1/\epsilon)} \underset{\epsilon \to 0}{\longrightarrow} 0.$$

And the proof is complete. □

We are now ready to prove Proposition 5.3.

Proof of Proposition 5.3. As defined in Lemma 5.2,

$$m^{\epsilon,v}(\Pi) = \frac{1}{\epsilon^2 \log(1/\epsilon)} \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} M_{ij}\, \mathbb{E}\left(\left\langle \partial_{ij}^S X(\Pi), v\right\rangle^2\right) \;+\; \frac{bl}{\epsilon^2 \log(1/\epsilon)} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbb{E}\left(\left\langle \partial_{i}^K X(\Pi), v\right\rangle^2\right).$$

To bound the second term in the RHS, we note that, by definition, $\mathcal{S}_i^k(\Pi)$ and Π only differ in one component, so from the definition of $\partial_i^K X(\Pi)$ (equation (9)), it is not hard to see that

$$\left\langle \partial_{i}^K X(\Pi), v\right\rangle^2 \;\leq\; \frac{4}{l^2}||v||_\infty^2.$$

It follows that

$$\frac{bl}{\epsilon^2 \log(1/\epsilon)}\; \mathbb{E}(\left\langle \partial_{i}^K X(\Pi), v\right\rangle^2) \leq \frac{4b}{l^2\epsilon^2 \log(1/\epsilon)}||v||_\infty^2.$$

Since $b/\epsilon \equiv b^\epsilon/\epsilon \to b_\infty$, and $l^\epsilon \epsilon = l\epsilon \to \infty$, this term converges and can be bounded from above, uniformly in Π and $\epsilon \in (0,1)$.

For the second term on the RHS, we simply note that expanding $\frac{1}{\epsilon^2 \log(1/\epsilon)}\mathbb{E}\left(\left\langle \partial_{ij}^S X(\Pi), v\right\rangle^2\right)$ (see equation (11)), yields a sum of four terms of the form that can be upper bounded by

$$\frac{||v||_\infty^2}{\epsilon^2 l^2 \log(1/\epsilon)}\mathbb{E}(|k \in S,\; \Pi_k \in p_1|\; |k \in S,\; \Pi_k \in p_2|),$$

where p_1 and p_2 are alternatively replaced by $\{\pi\}, \mathcal{I}_{ij}^{-1}(\pi)$ with $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_N$. Finally,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\mathbb{E}(|k \in S,\; \Pi_k \in p_1|\; |k \in S,\; \Pi_k \in p_2|)}{l^2\epsilon^2 \log(1/\epsilon)} &= \frac{1}{\epsilon^2 l^2 \log(1/\epsilon)}\mathbb{E}(\sum_{k=1}^{l} 1_{\Pi_k \in p_1} 1_{k\in S} \sum_{k'=1}^{l} 1_{\Pi_{k'} \in p_2} 1_{k'\in S}) \\
&= \frac{1}{l^2\epsilon^2 \log(1/\epsilon)} \sum_{k=1}^{l}\sum_{k'=1}^{l} 1_{\Pi_k \in p_1} 1_{\Pi_{k'} \in p_2}\mathbb{E}(1_{k\in S} 1_{k'\in S}) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{l^2\epsilon^2 \log(1/\epsilon)}\mathbb{E}(\sum_{k=1}^{l}\sum_{k'=1}^{l} 1_{k\in S} 1_{k'\in S})
\end{aligned}$$

and using Lemma 5.7 the term on the RHS also converges and can also be bounded from above, which completes the proof. □

5.2 Tightness: Proof of Proposition 5.4

We follow closely Fournier and Méléard [2004]. It is sufficient to prove that for every $v \in \mathcal{M}_N$, the projected process $(\langle \xi^\epsilon, v\rangle\,;\; \epsilon > 0)$ is tight. To this end, we use Aldous criterium Aldous [1989]. We first note that

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} |\,\langle \xi_t^\epsilon, v\rangle\,| \;\leq\; ||v||_\infty,$$

which implies that that for every deterministic $t \in [0,T]$, the sequence of random variables $(\langle \xi_t^\epsilon, v\rangle\,;\epsilon > 0)$ is tight. It remains to show that the martingale part and the drift part of the semi-martingale $\langle \xi^\epsilon, v\rangle$ are tight. Let $\delta > 0$, and take two stopping times τ^ϵ and σ^ϵ (w.r.t. to the filtration generated by the semi-martingale) such that $0 \leq \tau^\epsilon \leq \sigma^\epsilon \leq \tau^\epsilon + \delta \leq T$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left(|M_{\sigma^\epsilon}^{\epsilon,v} - M_{\tau^\epsilon}^{\epsilon,v}|\right)^2 &\leq \mathbb{E}\left((M_{\sigma^\epsilon}^{\epsilon,v} - M_{\tau^\epsilon}^{\epsilon,v})^2\right) \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left(\langle M_{\sigma^\epsilon}^{\epsilon,v}\rangle - \langle M_{\tau^\epsilon}^{\epsilon,v}\rangle\right) \\
&= \epsilon \log(1/\epsilon) \int_{\sigma^\epsilon}^{\tau^\epsilon} m^{\epsilon,v}(\Pi^\epsilon(s))ds
\end{aligned}$$

As ϵ goes to 0, the RHS goes to 0 by Proposition 5.3. Thus, there exists C_1 such that

$$\mathbb{E}\left(|M^{\epsilon,v}_{\sigma^\epsilon} - M^{\epsilon,v}_{\tau^\epsilon}|\right) \;\leq\; C_1\sqrt{\delta}.$$

thus showing the tightness of $(M^{\epsilon,v};\epsilon>0)$. We now turn to the drift part. First,

$$|B^{\epsilon,v}_{\sigma^\epsilon} \;-\; B^{\epsilon,v}_{\tau^\epsilon}| \;\;\leq\;\; \int_{\tau^\epsilon}^{\sigma^\epsilon} |\left\langle {}^tG^\epsilon(X(\Pi^\epsilon_s)), v\right\rangle| ds$$

We already showed in (13), that the integrand on the RHS is uniformly bounded in ϵ. Thus, there exists C_2 such that:

$$|B^{\epsilon,v}_{\sigma^\epsilon} \;-\; B^{\epsilon,v}_{\tau^\epsilon}| \;\;\leq\;\; \delta C_2.$$

This completes the proof of the tightness of $(B^{\epsilon,v};\epsilon>0)$, and the proof of Proposition 5.4.

Acknowledgements

We thank Florence Débarre and Amaury Lambert for helpful discussions.

References

D. Aldous. Stopping times and tightness. ii. *Ann. Probab.*, 17(2):586–595, 04 1989.

J. L. Bouzat. Conservation genetics of population bottlenecks: the role of chance, selection, and history. *Conservation Genetics*, 11(2):463–478, 2010.

P.G. Doyle and J.L. Snell. *Random Walks and Electric Networks*, volume 22. Mathematical Association of America, 1 edition, 1984.

N. Fournier and S. Méléard. A microscopic probabilistic description of a locally regulated population and macroscopic approximations. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 14(4):1880–1919, 11 2004.

S. Gavrilets. Waiting time to parapatric speciation. *Proc. R. Sco. Lond. B.*, 267(1), 2000.

S. Gavrilets, H. Li, and M.D. Vose. Rapid parapatric speciation on holey adaptive landscapes. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B*, 265:1483–1489, 1998.

S. Gavrilets, R. Acton, and J. Gravner. Dynamics of speciation and diversification in a metapopulation. *Evolution*, 54:1493–1501, 2000a.

S. Gavrilets, H. Li, and M.D. Vose. Patterns of parapatric speciation. *Evolution*, 54(4):1126–1134, 2000b.

R. C. Griffiths. Neutral two-locus multiple allele models with recombination. *Theor. Popul. Biol.*, 19(2):169–186, 1981.

R. C. Griffiths. The two-locus ancestral graph. In I.V. Basawa and R. L. Taylor, editors, *Selected Proceeedings of the Symposium on Applied Probability*, pages 100–117. Institute of Mathematical Statistics, 1991.

T. B. Hashimoto, Y. Sun, and T. S. Jaakkola. From random walks to distances on unweighted graphs. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, NIPS'15, pages 3429–3437, Cambridge, MA, USA, 2015. MIT Press.

R.R. Hudson. Properties of the neutral model with intragenic recombination. *Theor.Pop.Biol.*, 23(2):213–201, 1983.

O. Ivanciuc. Qsar and qspr molecular descriptors computed from the resistance distance and electrical conductance matrices. *ACH Models in Chemistry*, 5/6(137):607–632, 2000.

M. Kimura. Evolutionary rate at the molecular level. *Nature*, 217, 1968.

M. Kimura and T. Ohta. The average number of generations until extinction of an individual mutant gene in finite population. *Genetics*, 3(63), 1969.

D. Klein and M. Randic. Resistance distance. *Journal of Mathematical Chemistry*, (12):81 – 95, 1993.

D. Liben-Nowell and J. Kleinberg. The link prediction problem for social networks. *International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management (CIKM)*, pages 556–559, 2003.

A.J. Noest. Instability of the sexual continuum. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B*, 264:1389–1393, 1997.

H. Qiu and E.R. Hancock. Image segmentation using commute times. *Proceedings of the 16th British Machine Vision Conference (BMVC)*, pages 929–938, 2005.

K. Roy. Topological descriptors in drug design and modeling studies. *Molecular Diversity*, 4(8): 321–323, 2004.

U. Von Luxburg, A. Radl, and M. Hein. Hitting and commute times in large random neighborhood graphs. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 15(1):1751–1798, 2014.

R. Yamaguchi and Y. Iwasa. First passage time to allopatric speciation. *Interface Focus*, 3(6), 2013.

R. Yamaguchi and Y. Iwasa. Smallness of the number of incompatibility loci can facilitate parapatric speciation. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 405:36–45, 2015.

L. Yen, D. Vanvyve, F. Wouters, F. Fouss, M. Verleysen, and M. Saerens. Clustering using a random walk based distance measure. *In Proceedings of the 13th Symposium on Artificial Neural Networks (ESANN)*, pages 317–324, 2005.